| NUMBER CDD-14   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| PROPOSED COUNCIL STUDY ISSUE  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| For Calendar Year: 2004   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Continuing  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| New   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Previous Year (below line/defer)  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Issue: Air Quality Sub-element  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Lead Department: Community Development Department   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| General Plan Element or Sub-Element: Air Quality  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. What are the key elements of the issue? What precipitated it?  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| The Sunnyvale General Plan consists of 23 documents organized as elements or sub-<br>elements. The Air Quality Sub-element is part of the Environmental Management Element<br>and was adopted in 1993 and has not been updated. Air Quality is not a state mandated<br>element of a general plan. The element focuses primarily on vehicle emissions and the<br>City's position on regional and state programs and legislation. Since the adoption of the sub-<br>element, the region has been declared an area of non-attainment and the regional air quality<br>agency (Bay Area Air Quality Management District) has taken actions to further promote air<br>quality. These actions have largely been consistent with the Air Quality Sub-element. This<br>study issue would update the Air Quality Sub-element. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2. How does this relate to the General Plan or existing City Policy?  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Legislative Management Sub-Element  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| <b>GOAL 7.3A:</b> assess community conditions, and make appropriate changes to long-range, mid-range and short-range plans.   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Policy 7.3A.1 Utilize the General Plan as the City's principal long-range planning tool; utilize the Resource Allocation Plan as the City's principal mid-range planning tool; and the Legislative Calendar as the City's principal short-range planning tool.  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7.3A.1c Review and update each General Plan Sub-element approximately every 5 years.  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3. Origin of issue:   |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Councilmember:  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

General Plan:

Staff

Staff:

|    | BOARD or COMMIS   | SION               |                      |                           |               |                  |  |  |
|----|---|--------------------|----------------------|---------------------------|---------------|------------------|--|--|
|    | Arts  |                    |                      | Library                   |               |                  |  |  |
|    | Bldg. Code of Appe  | als                |                      | Parks & Rec.              |               |                  |  |  |
|    | CCAB  |                    |                      | Personnel                 |               |                  |  |  |
|    | Heritage & Preserva   | ation              |                      | Planning                  |               |                  |  |  |
|    | Housing & Human S   | Svcs               |                      |                           |               |                  |  |  |
|    | Board / Commission  | n Rankiı           | ng/Com               | nment:                    |               |                  |  |  |
|    | item was identified afto<br>tudy.                           | er the Pla         | anning               | Commission selected their | r items to re | ecommend         |  |  |
|    |   | Board / (          | Commi                | ssion ranked              | of            |                  |  |  |
| 4. | Due date for Contin   | uing an            | d Mano               | latory issues (if known): |               |                  |  |  |
| 5. | Multiple Year Project                                       | t? Yes             |                      | No Expected Year of       | Completio     | <b>n</b> 1.5 yrs |  |  |
| 6. | Estimated work hours for completion of the study issue.     |                    |                      |                           |               |                  |  |  |
|    | (a) Estimated work hours from the lead department           |                    |                      |                           |               | 200              |  |  |
|    | (b) Estimated work  | hours fr           | om co                | nsultant(s):              |               |                  |  |  |
|    | (c) Estimated work hours from the City Attorney's Office:   |                    |                      |                           | 20            |                  |  |  |
|    | (d) List any other department(s) and number of work hours:  |                    |                      |                           |               |                  |  |  |
|    | Department(s):  |                    | Works (<br>ition (60 |                           | 20            | 00               |  |  |
|    | Total Estimated Hours:                                      |                    |                      |                           |               | 420              |  |  |
| 7. | Expected participation involved in the study issue process? |                    |                      |                           |               |                  |  |  |
|    | (a) Does Council ne   | Yes $oxed{oxtime}$ | No 🗌                 |                           |               |                  |  |  |
|    | (b) Does this issue require review by a Board/Commission?   |                    |                      |                           |               | No 🗌             |  |  |
|    | If so, which Planning Commission Board/Commission?          |                    |                      |                           |               |                  |  |  |
|    | (c) Is a Council Study Session anticinated?                 |                    |                      |                           | Yes 🕅         | No 🗆             |  |  |

## (d) What is the public participation process?

Outreach to businesses and residents, public hearings with Planning Commission and City Council.

| City Manager  |  |   | Date   |  |  |  |  |  |
|---|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| approved by   |  |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Department Director   |  |   | Date   |  |  |  |  |  |
| wed by  |  |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| The Air Quality Sub-element has been used to monitor regional and state air quality legislation and still provides adequate guidance on city policies. Also, there are a high number of potential study items for 2003 which appear to have a higher priority to the community. Staff finds there is no urgency to update this sub-element this year. |  |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Explain below staff's recommendation if "for" or "against" study. Department director should also note the relative importance of this study to other major projects that the department is currently working on or that are soon to begin, and the impact on existing services/priorities.   |  |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| □ Defer   |  |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|   |  |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|   |  |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|   |  |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Staff Recommendation  |  |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10 Year RAP Total   | \$   |   | _  |  |  |  |  |  |
| New Revenues or Savings   |  |   | _  |  |  |  |  |  |
| New Annual Operating Costs  | \$   |   | _  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Capital Budget Costs  | \$   |   | _  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cost of Study   | \$   | 30,000  | (Air Quality consultant)   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Estimated Fiscal Impact:  |  |   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|   | Cost of Study Capital Budget Costs New Annual Operating Costs New Revenues or Savings 10 Year RAP Total  Staff Recommendation  Recommended Against Study No Recommendation Defer  ain below staff's recommendation stor should also note the relative that the department is curticle impact on existing services. Air Quality Sub-element has been lation and still provides adequated over of potential study items for 20 munity. Staff finds there is no urgent weed by  Department Director | Cost of Study Capital Budget Costs  New Annual Operating Costs  New Revenues or Savings  10 Year RAP Total  Staff Recommendation  Recommended for Study  Against Study  No Recommendation  Defer  ain below staff's recommendation if ctor should also note the relative impacts that the department is currently with the impact on existing services/priorities. Air Quality Sub-element has been used lation and still provides adequate guidant over of potential study items for 2003 white munity. Staff finds there is no urgency to unwed by  Department Director | Cost of Study  Capital Budget Costs  New Annual Operating Costs  New Revenues or Savings  10 Year RAP Total  Staff Recommendation  Recommended for Study  Against Study  No Recommendation  Defer  ain below staff's recommendation if "for" or "again extor should also note the relative importance of this exts that the department is currently working on or the impact on existing services/priorities.  Air Quality Sub-element has been used to monitor regulation and still provides adequate guidance on city policion and still provides ad |  |  |  |  |  |